



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,538	12/28/2004	Yoshiko Hino	47233-0049-00-US (220489)	2594
55694 7590 03/09/2010 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC) 1500 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209			EXAMINER PADEN, CAROLYN A	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/09/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/519,538	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HINO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Carolyn A. Paden	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-20-09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanebo (JP 06-292544) in view of Rusoff (2,957,769) for reasons of record.

Kanebo discloses the preparation of a beverage containing fats and oils that is filled into a hermetically sealed container. Extracted solutions of cocoa beans are mixed with water and an emulsifying agent and the mixture is heated to less than 85C and then homogenized (abstract and Table 1 and page 19 of translation). Milk is included in the beverage (see Key for Table 1 on page 19). The homogenization step is said to create a stable beverage solution. The claims appear to differ from Kanebo in the preparation of the extract and in the use of a centrifuge in the process. Rusoff teaches extracting cocoa beans with hot water (see example 1 and column 3, lines 70-75). When fine particle sizes of the cacao beans are used, Rusoff suggests there is a need for filtering the extract (column 4,

Art Unit: 1794

lines 39-47). The use of a centrifuge to filter the cocoa extract is described at column 4, lines 66-70. The final cocoa extract is said to contain 2-65 solids (column 4, lines 72-74), as required in claim 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the extraction method of Rusoff and centrifuge the extract of Kanebo to create a cacao extract containing smaller particles in it. It is appreciated that the temperature of centrifugation is not mentioned but one of ordinary skill in the art, who desired a high fat chocolate beverage, would be expected to centrifuge the cocoa above the melting point of the cocoa fat so that the fat does not solidify and be removed from the extract during processing. It is also appreciated that the fat content of the beverage is not mentioned but one of ordinary skill in the art would be expected to adjust the extent of fat extraction from the cacao nib by varying extraction time and the size of the cocoa nib as suggested by Rusoff (column 4, lines 30-44). Although milk is not mentioned, chocolate milk is known in the art. To add milk to chocolate would have been an obvious way to utilize the beverage of Kanebo.

Applicant argues that the references only mention the use of a centrifuge but centrifugation is suggested as an alternative and

Art Unit: 1794

equivalent conventional means of filtration. Applicant argues that a disk centrifuge is not mentioned in the references. This has been considered but is not persuasive. It is appreciated that a disk centrifuge is not mentioned but Rusoff teaches centrifugation as an alternative to filtration. The selection of a disk centrifuge would be expected to also act to filter the cocoa ingredients as a centrifuge. No unobvious or unexpected result is seen from the selection of a disk centrifuge in the process of separating liquid from solid cocoa ingredients. As to the recitation "for two phase liquid-solid separation", one of ordinary skill in the art would expect a centrifuge to effect two phase liquid solid separation because the centrifuge is used as an alternative to filtration.

Applicant argues that Rusoff also separates fat from water in his extraction. This has been considered but is not persuasive. The passage referring to centrifugation at column 4, lines 30-75 relates to liquid/solid separation and not to fat/water separation. Solids would be expected to separate from liquids as a result of the filtration by centrifugation process of the claims.

Applicant argues that Kanebo uses paper filters in his process but Kanebo is not the only reference relied upon in the rejection. The claims are rejected over Kanebo in view of Rusoff.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached by dialing 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private

Application/Control Number: 10/519,538  
Art Unit: 1794

Page 6

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carolyn Paden/

Primary Examiner 1794